

REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated February 9, 2007. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 8-22 have been added. Claims 1 and 3-22 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner:

- rejected the title as not being descriptive; and
- rejected claims 1 - 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pitzel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,062,765).

Information Disclosure Statement

As an initial matter, Applicant filed an IDS on October, 16, 2006. However, an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form from the IDS was not attached to the present Office Action to indicate that all of those references were considered by the Examiner. Applicant requests that the Examiner consider the references from the IDS filed October, 16, 2006 and attach to the next correspondence an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form to indicate that all of those references have been considered.

Title

The title has been amended to be more descriptive and clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Specification

The disclosure was amended to put in the patent application serial numbers. No new matter has been added.

Overview of the Current Invention

Preferred Embodiments of the present invention provide an improved method and apparatus for configuring a local run-time environment for a user on the client workstation. Today it is common for most corporate networks to use logon scripts because they assist with centralized administration. Logon scripts are difficult to create, edit, and administer. Also logon scripts in certain run-time environments such as Windows NT/2000/2003/XP/Vista can be assigned to a single user or multiple users. Logon scripts are aptly name configuration files that run upon user logon to a workstation or client system. The present invention allows configurations of a local run-time environment for one or more user accounts on a client system based on whether or not the client system is a portable system e.g. laptop as opposed to desktop system. This is important because prior art systems do not differentiate the runtime environment for a portable system. Applying configuration settings to a portable device many times requires a network connection. For example, if a portable device tries to connect to a network drive or download an update to an operating system or antivirus update, this often results in a warning message. These types of messages often times confuse rather than assist the user.

In order to more particularly point out this feature for configuring a local run-time environment condition only in response to determining if a client system is a portable system (as opposed to desktop), the following language has been added to the independent claim 1 as follows:

1. (Currently Amended) A method in a client-server environment, to manage a configuration of resources on at least one client system, the method on a client system comprising:

receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a CPU in a client system is one of a mobile type to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system, wherein the one or more selectable configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable configuration settings therein; and

determining if the environmental condition indicates that the client system is a portable system; and

in response to the environmental condition indicating that the client system is a portable system then applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system.

Support for this amendment is found on page 19, paragraph [0074] through page 20 paragraph [0079] and figures 10 and 11. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

As noted above, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pitzel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,062,765). Independent claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over Pitzel. The Examiner at page 3 of the office action states *"As to claim 1, Pitzel et al teaches a method [...] receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a client system is one of a desktop and a portable system to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system wherein the one or more selectable configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable configuration settings therein."* However, careful reading of Pitzel discloses only one location where the word "portable" is used and that is at col. 3, lines 54-58. Specifically in the words of Pitzel: *"Furthermore, the client computer 104, the configuration server 112, the component*

server 116, and the download server 118 may be desktop, server, portable, hand-held, set-top, or any other desired type of configuration. Furthermore, the client computer 104, the configuration server 112, and the component server 116, and the download server 118 each may be used in connection with various operating systems such as: UNIX, LINUX, Disk Operating System (DOS), OS/2, Windows 3.X, Windows 95, Windows 98, and Windows NT.” Clearly, Pitzel is teaching broadly that the client system can be any type of computer; however, Pitzel is completely silent on using the fact that the client machine is a portable machine (as opposed to a desktop) as an environmental condition to determine as whether to apply a configuration setting. Independent claim 1 of the present invention has been amended to further clarify how the portable detection occurs “receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a CPU in a client system is one of a mobile type to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system.” Pitzel is completely silent on using information, whether or not the client computer 104 is a portable computer, to apply selectable configuration settings. Moreover, Pitzel makes no mention of portable detection based on CPU in the client system that is Pitzel is silent on:

determining if the environmental condition indicates that the client system is a portable system; and
in response to the environmental condition indicating that the client system is a portable system then applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system.

The Examiner cites 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and a proper rejection requires that a single reference teach (i.e., identically describe) each and every element of the rejected claims as being anticipated by Pitzel.¹ Because the elements in independent claims 1 of

¹ See MPEP §2131 (Emphasis Added) “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.”

receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a CPU in a client system is one of a mobile type to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system [...]

determining if the environmental condition indicates that the client system is a portable system; and

in response to the environmental condition indicating that the client system is a portable system then applying at least one of the one or more selectable configuration settings on the client system.

are not taught or disclosed by Pitzel. No detection of a portable client system 104 is taught or suggested by Pitzel for applying configuration settings. Accordingly, the present invention distinguishes over Pitzel for at least this reason. The Applicants respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to distinguish over Pitzel. Claims 3-7 depend from claim 1, since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claims 3-7 distinguish over Pitzel, as well.

With respect to claim 3, the Examiner states on page 6, paragraph 6, "*As to claims 2-3, Pitzel et al. teach that the determining if the environmental condition is met where the client system is a portable system includes determining/verifying the client components (hardware/software) and assigning a confidence value (identifier) to each components (figures 2-3 and column 5 line 64 to column 7 line 11).*" The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 2 has been cancelled rendering this rejection moot. However claim 3 recites:

3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the determining if the environmental condition is met where the client system is a portable system includes assigning a confidence value to each of the following:

a client CPU is a mobile type;
a PC Card driver is started;
a PC Card is inserted in a socket;
a system battery is present;
an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) is connected; and
a portable power scheme is selected in an operating system
and using one or more of the confidence values to determine if the client system
is a laptop.

are not taught or disclosed by Pitzel. No detection of a portable client system 104 is taught or suggested by Pitzel for applying configuration settings. Pitzel does not suggest, mention or teach any of these terms “a client CPU is a mobile type”; “a PC Card driver is started”; “a PC Card is inserted in a socket”; “a system battery is present”; “an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) is connected”; and “a portable power scheme is selected in an operating system” and using one or more of the confidence values to determine if the client system is a laptop.” The Examiner is respectfully requested to point out with particularity where Pitzel teaches this type of specific and material detection features.² Accordingly, claim 3 of the present invention distinguishes over Pitzel for at least this reason.

² Although the claims are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102, the Federal Circuit held a reference did not render the claimed combination *prima facie* obvious because *inter alia*, the Examiner ignored material, claimed temperature limitations which were absent from the reference. See MPEP §2143.01 In *In re Fine*, the claims were directed to a system for detecting and measuring minute quantities on nitrogen compounds comprising a gas chromatograph, a converter which converts nitrogen compounds into nitric oxide by combustion, and a nitric oxide detector. The primary reference disclosed a system for monitoring sulfur compounds comprising a chromatograph, combustion means, and a detector, and the secondary reference taught nitric oxide detectors. The Examiner and Board asserted that it would have been within the skill of the art to substitute one type of detector for another in the system of the primary reference, however the court found there was no support or explanation of this conclusion and reversed.

With regards to newly added claims 8-13, these claims have been added to positively recite a specific type of portable device detection from cancelled claim 2. Pitzel makes no mention of portable detection based on PC Card Driver is started in the client system. Independent claim 8 recites *inter alia*:

receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a PC Card driver is started in a client system is started to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system, wherein the one or more selectable configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable configuration settings therein

Accordingly, independent claim 8 distinguishes over Pitzel as well. Claims 9-13 depend from independent claim 8. Since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claims 9-13 distinguish over Pitzel, as well.

With regards to newly added claims 14-19, these claims have been added to positively recite a specific type of portable device detection from cancelled claim 2. Pitzel makes no mention of portable detection based on PC Card is inserted in a socket in the client system. Independent claim 14 recites *inter alia*:

receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a PC Card is inserted in a socket in a client system to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system, wherein the one or more selectable configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable configuration settings therein;

Accordingly, independent claim 14 distinguishes over Pitzel as well. Claims 15-19 depend from independent claim 14. Since dependent claims contain all the limitations of the independent claims, claims 15-18 distinguish over Pitzel, as well.

With regards to newly added claim 20, this claim has been added to positively recite a specific type of portable device detection from cancelled claim 2. Pitzel makes no

mention of portable detection based on whether a system battery is present in the client system. Independent claim 20 recites *inter alia*:

receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a system battery is present in a client system to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system, wherein the one or more selectable configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable configuration settings therein; and

Accordingly, independent claim 20 distinguishes over Pitzel as well.

With regards to newly added claim 22, this claim has been added to positively recite a specific type of portable device detection from cancelled claim 2. Pitzel makes no mention of portable detection based on whether an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) is connected to the client system. Independent claim 21 recites *inter alia*:

receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether an uninterruptible power supply (UPS) is connected to a client system to determine whether one or more selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system, wherein the one or more selectable configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable configuration settings therein;

Accordingly, independent claim 21 distinguishes over Pitzel as well.

With regards to newly added claim 21, this claim has been added to positively recite a specific type of portable device detection from cancelled claim 2. Pitzel makes no mention of portable detection based on whether a portable power scheme is selected in an operating system running on the client system. Independent claim 22 recites *inter alia*:

receiving at least one local run-time environmental condition including at least one condition based on whether a portable power scheme is selected in an operating system running on a client system to determine whether one or more

selectable configuration settings are applied on the client system, wherein the one or more selectable configuration settings are previously set graphically using a graphical user interface with one or more user selectable configuration settings therein;

Accordingly, independent claim 22 distinguishes over Pitzel as well.

CONCLUSION

The prior art made of record and not relied upon was reviewed and Applicants believe that such prior art is not pertinent to Applicants' disclosure.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants acknowledge the continuing duty of candor and good faith to disclose information known to be material to the examination of this application. In accordance with 37 CFR §1.56, all such information is dutifully made of record. The foreseeable equivalents of any territory surrendered by amendment are limited to the territory taught by the information of record. No other territory afforded by the doctrine of equivalents is knowingly surrendered and everything else is unforeseeable at the time of this amendment by the Applicants and their attorneys.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to change any fees that may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-1556. In view of the preceding discussion, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and re-examination is requested.

Appl. No. 10/700,615
Docket No. 570-P0002
Reply to Office Action of December 6, 2006

PLEASE CALL the undersigned if the Examiner believes that there are any informalities that can be corrected by Examiner's amendment, or that in any way it would help expedite the prosecution of the patent application.

Respectfully submitted.

Date: May 9, 2007

By: /Jon Gibbons/
Jon A. Gibbons(Reg. No.37,333)
Attorney for Applicant

FLEIT KAIN GIBBONS
GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO P.L.
One Boca Commerce Center
551 N.W. 77th Street
Suite 111, Boca Raton, Florida 33487
Telephone: (561) 989-9811
Facsimile: (561) 989-9812
www.FocusOnIP.com